THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE

A MAGAZINE OF DEFINITE PROGRESS AND VIRILE OPTIMISM IN RELIGION

"Speak unto this people that they go forward"

MAY
1911

ONE DOLLAR
A YEAR

SINGLE COPIES
TEN CENTS

ISSUED FROM THE NEW YORK UNITARIAN HEADQUARTERS. 104 EAST TWENTIETH STREET NEW YORK. THE FIRST DAY OF EACH MONTH

NEW YORK to NEW ORLEANS

An Ideal Voyage on Southern Seas

BY MAGNIFICENT 10,000-TON

SOUTHERN PACIFIC STEAMSHIPS

Sailings Wednesdays and Saturdays from either port.

40.00 ONE WAY **70.00** ROUND TRIP **70.00** RETURNING BY RAIL

including meals and berth

Convincing Literature Yours for the Asking. L. H. Nutting, G. P.A., 366, 1158 or 1 B'way, New York

COMMONWEALTH HOTEL (Inc.)

Opposite State House, Boston, Mass.

Offers rooms with hot and cold water for $1.00 per day and up, which includes free use of public shower baths.

Nothing to Equal This in New England

Rooms with private bath for $1.50 per day and up; suites of two rooms and bath for $4.00 per day and up. Dining Room and Cafe First-Class European Plan.

Absolutely Fire-Proof

Stone floors, nothing wood but the doors.
Equipped with its own Vacuum Cleaning Plant.
Long Distance Telephone in Every Room.
Strictly a Temperance Hotel.
Send for booklet.

STORER F. CRAFTS
Gen. Mgr.

BY GEORGE HENRY BADGER

The Water Star

Essays of the out-of-doors; parables of every day life, drawn from the page of Nature, containing The Water Star, Landscape of the Soul, The Haunts of The Hind, and Do We See Nature?

Cloth, with gracefully illuminated cover. 80 cents.

Sea Moods

A dainty collection of Sea poems, drawing their inspiration chiefly from sojournings at the Isles of Shoals, and the Maine Coast.

In paper. Price 15 cents.

At The Year's High Tide

A little group of Summer-time verses, especially of the hills and the ocean.

In paper, with graceful cover. 25 cents.

FOR SALE AT

New York Unitarian Headquarters
104 East Twentieth Street
New York.

The Unitarian Advance

GEORGE H. BADGER, Editor

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, CHARLES WESLEY CASSON, HENRY WILDER FOOTE, EDGAR SWAN WIERS, FREDERICK ROBERTSON GRIFFIN, ALSON HAVEN ROBINSON.

Contents for May, 1911

EDITORIAL 267

CONSTRUCTIVE REFORM 270

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION ..... Rev. Thomas Van Ness 271

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW 272

RELIGION AND THE COMMON LIFE ..... Mrs. H. W. Welles 273

THE READJUSTMENT OF THE MODERN CHURCH . Rev. Wm. H. Ramsey 277

THE CHURCH AND POLITICS 281

THE MODERN CHURCH AND SOCIAL REFORM
Conducted by John Haynes Holmes 283

SYMPOSIUM: All Souls' (Universalist-Unitarian Churches) 287

ANNIVERSARY WEEK PROGRAM 292

NEW ENGLAND LETTER ..... Alson H. Robinson 293

NEW BOOKS 295

A CORRECTION 296

Contributing Editors: Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, of New York; Rev. Jabez T. Sunderland, of Hartford, Conn; Pres. Franklin C. Southworth, of Meadville, Pa.; Rev. Thomas Van Ness, of Boston; Rev. Wilson M. Backus, of Minneapolis, Minn.

Subscription Price, One Dollar. Send remittance by check or money order, made payable to THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE, 104 East Twentieth Street, New York.

Published by THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE ASSOCIATION: GEORGE H. BADGER, President and Treasurer; EDGAR S. WIERS, Secretary.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office in New York.

New York Unitarian Headquarters, 104 East Twentieth Street, New York

This Is The Publishers' Page--

—Not the Editor's! It is for Advertising. Our peculiarity is that we advertise things that are not for sale, but things that are offered free—mostly Ideas, Opportunities, Causes. It is a peculiarity of purpose, however, not of methods.

As everybody knows, the Publishers of THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE are not in this business for the sake of profit, but for the sake of ideas. The Publishers are simply those of the Editorial Board who assume the privilege, not of sharing the dividends, (there are none)—but of sharing the Deficit —which is very actual, and larger than was anticipated. They are willing to pay money for the chance to push an Idea.

What is the Idea? Not any one man's pet hobby,—not Anti-Conservatism, or Anti-Radicalism, not Socialism, or Anti-Socialism—not Insurgency nor the Organization, not a Grouch against anything that is, as such,—but ADVANCE through the Open Door for Ideas,—the Progressward Point of View on every issue, the courage of giving every side a hearing, and letting the Truth prove itself by the outcome.

Some people believe in THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE more than some others do. Some believe in it so little that they talk it down. Some believe in it so eagerly that they TALK IT UP.

All we ask of our friends is, that if they believe in us, and our Idea,—believe that it is worth while that we succeed, and that it would mean misfortune to have us fail,—that then they will not only like us, and keep it to themselves, but pass the resolute word of good will along,—let other folks know about us, help other folks to catch THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE Idea.

That is all the advertising we want. There is fun paying the Deficit, even out of the clergyman's modest pocket-book—if only the Idea moves on.

The Unitarian Advance

Formerly The Unitarian. Established 1906. Old Number, Vol. VI, No. 5.

VOLUME I (*NEW SERIES*) MAY, 1911 NUMBER 9

THE Secretary of the Unitarian Conference of the Middle States and Canada has resigned, his resignation to take effect at the end of the Conference year, November first. For eight years he has served in this interesting and important field, and has enjoyed it immensely. But circumstances make it obvious that he would not enjoy it any longer. A different sort of service and a somewhat different ideal of department work from that which prevailed when he assumed office make it very apparent both to himself and others in authority that a man with different gifts and different ambitions could better work out the destinies of the Conference—and therefore the change. We continue to believe that in this section are at once some of the greatest missionary difficulties and most alluring opportunities that the denomination contains, and we trust that a leader may be found who can stalwartly and with accumulating success make good the promises of achievement that open here.

———o———

WE would deem it great good fortune if the opportunity occasioned by the readjustment of affairs in the Middle States Conference involved in the selection of a new Secretary could be utilized for a general resurvey of our whole national policy of department work. At present, of the five chief department divisions of the American Unitarian Association's missionary activity, no two are related to the A. U. A. in the same manner. In one field the Association pays all of the Field Secretary's salary, and controls all his work. In another it pays half the salary and divides responsibility. In a third the Conference pays all of its Secretary's salary and has control of his movements, though the A. U. A.'s money pays for most of the missionary work. In a fourth, there is no Field Secretary at all, but everything is directed from Boston. In a fifth, the Field Secretary gives only part of his time to, and derives only part of his income from the A. U. A., and is helped out by a Field Agent.

———o———

DIVERSITY of method is not necessarily an evil; but it may prove such, and perhaps the Middle States situation is more baffling than any other with which the A. U. A. has to deal. Of course, the diversity grows out of two paralleling, if not antagonizing, ideals of missionary administration. Shall the direction of all our national missionary work be centralized in one board and controlled practically by one leader, who shall find in various local agents simply the instrumentalities and means of achievement, or shall the direction of activity be distributed to several centres, having intimate relationship and co-operation with a central head, but with considerable division of responsibility and initiative in activity? There is much to be said for either ideal; and probably any successful method must to some degree partake of both. One ideal, perhaps in its extreme, has been tried out in the Western Conference. The other, perhaps also to its extreme, has always prevailed in New England. The Conference of the Middle States and Canada has tried to stand between the two extremes—and has not always had an easy time of it. But at all times it has insisted that its work is essen-

tially a part of the work of the A. U. A.; it has belonged inside and not outside of the national organization and the national method. Its ideal has been the national cause federated in a distributive method of administration; and despite all embarrassments of the past, we believe that the ideal ought to work. But it must work inside, and not outside, of the national organization. That is the Middle States idea.

———o———

THE proposal to remove the Meadville Theological School to Chicago where its work can be related with the enterprise of the Chicago University seems to us most significant. The Meadville School has a fine and noble tradition. It has given to our denomination some of its ablest and most efficient ministers; it has been one of our great denominational assets. But the fact cannot be disguised that it is seriously handicapped by its isolated situation. To-day the demands upon our ministry for equipment and scholarly training are most exacting. We need men of all-round culture. We need men whose training in theology should be no mere sequestered sojourn amidst an environment of "divinity and piety." The young men who naturally gravitate to Meadville for theological training rather than to the Harvard Divinity School, are peculiarly in need of the wider horizon and the more comprehensive background of scholarship which a large university can afford. President Southworth's foresight and courage of initiative in this matter cannot be commended too highly. The Unitarian fellowship has given generously to the equipment of this school—not because it happens to be located in Meadville, but because it is pre-eminently a training school for leaders in our liberal movement recruited largely from the virile sources of the great West. The aims of its benefactors would be best met and their trust best administered only by taking advantage of every opportunity possible to make this school vitally effective in doing this work. At Meadville the work must always be fettered, narrow and at disadvantage. At Chicago, it would vindicate, as now it cannot vindicate, the fullness of the dream that was with its founder, and behind the generosity of all its later friends.

———o———

AND behold, another champion of the unadulterated gospel of orthodoxy arises to smite down the heretic and eradicate error from the councils of the godly! This time a Presbyterian Doctor of Divinity in Pittsburg (we have two Unitarian churches in Pittsburg notwithstanding), would have Prof. Brown of Union Theological Seminary denounced and put out of his seat of authority because of recent articles touching New Theology published in "The Harvard Theological Review" and "The Observer." Interestingly enough, there are two Prof. Browns at the Union Seminary, one of them its President; and (more interesting still), they are both so heretical that the Pittsburg heresy-baiter has confused them and makes one man responsible for the publications of both. Undoubtedly the really worst heretic is the Prof. Brown who wrote the article on "The Old Theology and the New" in "The Harvard Theological Review." When we read that article we rubbed our hands with glee. (At moments of relaxation we are sometimes very wicked.) We knew that there was dynamite in that article. A great many distinguished (and some not so distinguished) preachers in the Presbyterian Church, and in other orthodox churches, are of course thinking the same things and believing the same things that Dr. Brown made manifest in this article. No doubt of that. But they are not thinking them so clearly nor speaking them with such persuasive frankness; and it is clarity

and frankness that make heresy perilous. We hope that Dr. McEwan of Pittsburg won't let up. We hope that it is a fight to the finish. Prof. Brown will enjoy it; Union Theological Seminary is so used to such things that an affair or so more of this sort won't hurt; the "Harvard Theological Review" will get some good advertising (and the more it can have the better, for it is an exceedingly valuable publication), and the cause of truth, which is greater than the cause of either orthodoxy or liberalism, will have more light thrown on interesting by-paths too often neglected.

—o—

WE are sure of it! Three days after this magazine is in the hands of our readers, we shall receive several excited letters, even a few vehement "discontinuances"—because of one of the articles appearing therein. And we shall smile—and continue things as before. It is a constant source of interest to us to discover that some very intelligent people can read well-stated articles in our pages and then persist in absolute misunderstanding of what they have plainly read. More interesting still, perhaps, is it to note that some of our readers seemingly read only the things they do not like—evidently from an inborn relish for exuberant indignation. Recently a good friend asked us: "Is The Unitarian Advance wholly committed to Socialism, or only one of its editors?" O course, our inevitable reply was: "Then you are not a reader of The Unitarian Advance?"

—o—

THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE is avowedly committed to one precise policy: **"An open door for ideas."** Its editors are firmly agreed amongst themselves not to agree on anything except on this: That the Unitarian cause can thrive only on the courage of fair-mindedness that gives the other side a chance. The precise reason why a certain associate editor was asked by the editor to take charge of a certain department was because the editor did not agree with him—but believed it would be for the health of us all not to avoid a pressing issue of today because of that. Others of our editorial board have as frankly expressed views "contrary-minded" on other pages.

—o—

WE may confess very frankly that we do not agree with the specific article in this issue which is the occasion of the foregoing comment. With very much of it, indeed, we are in hearty accord—and every bit of it, we believe, is worth thinking about. But we believe that one may easily fall into the error of considering a political party, as well as a church, or an institution, as too concretely an individual entity. The Republican party is simply a large aggregation of American people sharing common convictions—and prejudices, more or less over-bossed by more or less unworthy leaders—because so many individual Republicans are negligent of their party repsonsibilities. The Democratic party is likewise a large aggregation of American citizens sharing common convictions and prejudices—and likewise overbossed, for the same reason. The Socialist party is a smaller aggregation of American people sharing common convictions—and prejudices—who have the moral advantage of their smallness, that there is nothing in it for the bosses and professional politicians at their hands. We suspect that should the Socialistic party ever become a majority party the Boss and Professional Politician would not fail to be in evidence—and what would happen then! Socialism in the hands of a Boss presents some possibilities of dire dismay.

—o—

THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE has nothing to do with parties, as such; but to us, more than to Mr.

Holmes, perhaps, there seems great encouragement that in all parties to-day there is a growing sense of the issues of social justice and industrial emancipation, and a higher standard of civic purity and honor is insisted upon. It comes hard; and victory for virtue at the hands of any party, new or old, is not a holiday matter. But it is coming; and it is coming despite those who in former days controlled the destiny of parties—and the method of its coming just now seems to be along the path which is marked Insurgency.

———o———

WHAT is the significance of Insurgency—as it now appears in the vocabulary of politics, and elsewhere? Insurgency we understand to be the aggressive insistence of men associated with organizations which they have loved and held to, but which they feel have fallen in bad ways—to win the initial ideal back, not by "getting outside" and fighting from the breastworks of the enemy; but by rising with eager determination, inside, to make the thing they believe in prevail. They are against things as they are; but that does not mean that they will destroy things as they are; rather that they intend, if they can, to get contol of things as they are and make them what they ought to be. There are Republican insurgents and Democratic insurgents, and one of these days there will be Socialist insurgents, likely as not. There are insurgents in churches and social organizations of all sorts; often very wrong-headed, impulsively radical and foolishly obstreperous. A certain sort of folly always goes with every sort of enthusiasm. But insistence that a cause that is believed to be right shall not go wrong because of the control of unworthy leaders—is the heart of all worthy insurgency, and we believe that just now, in politics and elsewhere, it may have a vital significance.

CONSTRUCTIVE REFORM

THERE are two ways of advancing every reform. One is the destructive method. The other is the constructive. Many Unitarian ministers have employed the destructive method. "The pale negations of Unitarianism have in the past been the burden of too many a sermon. Some preachers have been so busy telling people what they didn't believe, have been so occupied in attacking orthodoxy, that they have given the impression that Unitarians didn't believe anything. Happily that day is past. In every vigorous and prosperous Unitarian church to-day the preacher is giving his constructive method, he is building up the faith of his hearers, not by telling them what they cannot believe, but by emjhasizing the positive faith of to-day's religious life. Our Unitarian churches can hope to live only when they stand for this positive message. There is no permanent vitality in a destructive gospel. Where tearing down is done it is only justified by the erection of a nobler mansion upon the foundations from which the rubbish has been cleared away.

The same principle holds in social reform. The denunciation of abuses is an ineffective way of dealing with them unless the way is pointed out for the development of more ideal conditions. The minister must not only awaken the conscience of the people; he must be able to guide them step by step in the upbuilding of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. It is not enough for him to declare that the tims are evil, he must have a constructive message of social righteousness. There are many churches which are doing this constructive work. They are not only dreaming of a heavenly Jerusalem. They are also working wisely to stop the growth of infernal conditions in the cities of America. The future student of social reform in the 19th and 20th centuries will trace many a constructive step to its source

in the religious life of our time. In this city he will find that the juvenile courts and the probation officers were inaugurated and supported by the private contributions of church adherents until the evidence of their value was so unquestionable that the whole community took up the work. In another city he will discover that the first public playground was opened by a little group of enlightened enthusiasts whose zeal had been quickened by a preacher of social righteousness, and was maintained by them until the municipality undertook its support. In many a State he will note that the most effective measures for the prevention of poverty, disease and crime were started by groups of private citizens who had to prove the efficiency of those measures before public support for them could be obtained, and if he traces to its source the inspiration of those public-minded citizens he will find that in many cases it was generated within the quiet study of some inconspicuous minister who had a constructive message of social righteousness.

Often we may feel that these constructive measures are pitifully small and weak. If we are sensitive to the evils grafted upon our modern civilization we are tempted to denounce the whole social organism. Our fig tree bears wizened and imperfect fruit and in our impatience we would fain cut it down and burn it. But the wise husbandman does not do that. He prunes it discreetly, and sprays it with insecticides, and cultivates the soil about it, that he may save it for the good fruit which it is capable of bringing forth. That is the way of social reform—the pruning knife to lop off evils as fast as we can reach them, the preventive measures to stop the growth of parasites, the wise cultivation of young life to bring forth the fruit of noble living in the generations to come. That is a better way than to cut down the whole tree, root and branch. In the upbuilding of social righteousness our ministers and churches must bear their part; but let them see to it that they are constructive, and not destructive reformers.

H. W. F.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

Can we have international arbitration such as President Taft suggests? Is it practical? Will the European nations accede to any such far-reaching plan? That is really not the first question for us here in the United States or for the people of England. The first question is, Can we talk of such a plan? Can we publicly discuss it? Can we hold meetings to further the cause of arbitration? Can we preach about it and get the newspapers to write about it? Surely we are psychologists enough to know that wars are not brought about because of sane and worthy reasons. No; they are brought about by what we may call emotions; that is, by fears, ambitions, pride, anger, by enthusiastic appeals to love of country, defense of home, altar, the throne, national honor, or what not.

It is the subconscious part of a nation that goes to war.

It is the animal, the fighting ancestor in a man, that really leads him to charge and to kill. Take, e. g., that cruel, bloodthirsty charge of the Polish regiment at Gravelotte upon the French artillery engineers. What caused it? Had the French ever done anything to harm the Poles? No. Was there any personal enmity? No. Any reason at all, either good or bad? No. Heredity, the subconscious, animated every Polish soldier. The regiment stood for hours in the burning sunlight, receiving the terrible pounding of the French fire, man after man falling bleeding, wounded, where he stood. The emotional strain upon the survivors was tremendous; the animal in every soldier was aroused; the desire for revenge was almost overpowering. Then, when in the estimation of old Steinmetz the critical moment

had come, the band was ordered to play Poland's national air—that forbidden tune in Russia and Eastern Germany. To the crash of brass came the imperative order to charge, and forward they went. Who went? Not the living, reasoning individuals known in their home towns, no; but madmen, driven forward by the ghosts of ancestors, animated, impelled by the sub-conscious, by the war spirit of ancient Poland.

Talk of war, or picture in the newspapers battleships and marching soldiers, and you tend to beget war. I mean to say, in the language of Dr. Hale, "That it is of no consequence that you are all the time protesting that war is impossible; if you talk about it you provoke it." Keep a subject constantly in mind and it will become an obsession. A sub-conscious process is set up tending to a conclusion with which rational thought has nothing to do. In one of the German illustrated papers I saw a picture of the field maneuvres. Soldiers of a certain rifle company were aiming at marks. These marks, or effigies, were dressed as French soldiers. Such tactics, even in time of peace, are calculated to stir up bad blood, to encourage hatred.

The constant talk in England about the hostility of Germany has produced a national state of mind which is very unfortunate.

German actions are now scrutinized with an unfriendly purpose. The English mind is prepared for an emotional crisis, exactly as was the Russian mind by the so-called Bulgarian atrocities, exactly as was the American mind by the so-called Cuban cruelties. The Czar could not keep back the onrush of the Slav people, hence war with Turkey. President McKinley, after the explosion of the Maine, could not keep back the onrush of American emotionalism, hence the Spanish-American war.

Talk arbitration, whether practical or not, at this juncture. That is the first step toward making it practical. Familiarize the mind with it. Keep the idea constantly before the American people. At last it will sink into the sub-conscious. Without quite knowing why, we will say, "Why, of course," or if we do not, our children will. Difficulties which now seem mountain high, will disappear. We will hardly know how.

THOMAS VAN NESS.

—o—

The Harvard Theological Review for April contains six notable articles: "Italian Modernism, Social and Religious," is well defined by Prof. William Frederic Bade, of the Pacific Theological School, after a year's careful research in Italy. Percy Ashley, M.A., of London, a former resident and present officer of the Parsmore Edwards Settlement, tells the interesting story of "University Settlements in Great Britain." "Jesus as Lord" is the title of a significant critical study by Benjamin Wisner Bacon, of the Yale Divinity School. "Beyond Moral Idealism," by Prof. Geo. P. Adams, of the University of California, certainly has challenge in it. "The Types of Authority in Religious Belief," by Prof. Clarence A. Beckwith, D.D., of the Chicago Theological Seminary (Congregational), might mean another heresy trial if its writer were Presbyterian, with a certain Pittsburg doctor of divinity to deal with, instead of Congregational, and of a household of faith where orthodoxy admits of modern variations. The last article, on "Reverence as the Heart of Christianity," is by Rev. Charles A. Allen, the Unitarian minister at Waverly, Mass.

—o—

We live in the best possible Universe because there is, and can be, only one Universe. There is no room for two infinities. One Universe and one Law. Precisely the same physical laws are around Sirius as are around our Earth. Know the law of the dust beneath your feet, and you know the law of the starry vault above your head. SAMUEL R. CALTHROP

The Religion and the Common Life

A LAYWOMAN'S POINT OF VIEW

By MRS. H. W. WELLES, of Montreal, Canada

THROUGHOUT the manifold discussions which have taken place recently regarding the proper sphere and functions of the Church, writers and speakers have persistently adopted one point of view, they have debated and discussed fro mthe standpoint of the Church, the Church's people, the Church's traditions, the Church's future.

To the lay mind it may seem that there would be advantage in facing the problem from another quarter, one more practical and less academic; in inquiring simply, Where is the Church most needed? What field of work cries most loudly for the help which she might conceivably be able to bestow? What would the world have to say in this controversy between faith and works, about the opportunity of the Church, if the world were interested and articulate enough to say anything?

In the first place, the world would probably require a definiton from the Unitarian Church of the difference, if any, existing between its position and that of the greater and more powerful churches which surround and antedate it; the questions, In what does your tradition consist? and What is your inspiration? might conceivably be asked. If the answer were given that our tradition is not consistency, but freedom, freedom from bondage to the dead hand of creeds formulated for other generations and embodied in words which themselves have suffered the subtle change of time which changes all, freedom from ecclesiastical domination, and the dragging weight of the conservative ideal, freedom that gives leave to walk and work according to the inner guiding of a creative spirit, the world might perhaps say that our freedom sets the standard of our responsibility, and that our sensitiveness to opportunity is the measure of the loyalty we owe to our vision.

Inasmuch as our religious position differs radically from that of the orthodox churches, and thus changes our attitude toward the world, it may be pertinent to inquire, What, after all, we have to offer as justification for our continued existence, and for the encouragement of the missionary spirit among us? What are the fields of religious effort which we must of necessity leave to others, and what our relation, or possible relations, to the common life?

In the first place, Unitarians, by virtue of their fundamental belief in the divine origin and perfectibility of human nature, are forever precluded from the use of that weapon which has been strongest in the armour of orthodoxy, the fear of personal damnation, the barbed arrow of conviction which saw in the church, and the sacraments administered by the church, the one way of escape provided from endless and hopeless torment. This is a truism, certainly, but it may be worth restating on account of its tremendous implications. We know with what entire and patient consistency the Catholic Church, still to-day the only complete and satisfying sacerdotal system believing absolutely in itself as the mediator, the actual saviour of man from God, surrounds every child born into its fold from the cradle with an elaborate system of ceremonies, a network which begins with the first breath, and ends only with the last, designed to capture the soul, wellnigh in its own despite, and to bear it into heaven, bound hand and

foot with sacramental grace borrowed from sources outside of itself. To save man from the vengeance of his Creator, to snatch a creature innately depraved and allied with evil from its natural destiny, and fit it for a sphere with which it has no more than a vicarious affinity, this it may well be imagined is a task which demands not only a sort of sanctified magical art, but the absorption of supernatural powers extended beyond the limits of human days.

And so in less measure of the other orthodox churches, whose principles differ only in degree from the Catholic, each of which demands belief or adherence of some kind to some doctrine, "as generally necessary to salvation"; each puts emphasis on what is done inside the doors of a church as being religious life rather than the conduct of the market-place, the home, and the workshops. A shrewd observer once compared the Catholic Church to a great and wide-spread tree, symmetrical and shadeful, the Greek Church to the same tree with half its branches lopped away, and Protestantism to the trunk reduced to the proportions of a telegraph pole. Which is illustrated by an incident occurring lately in a certain church whose minister having become actively engaged in a much-needed mission for the uplift of the lowest class of men and women in his town, was energetically taken to task by a good deacon for waste of the resources of the church. Why all this time and money lavished, he was asked, on the hopelessly degraded, when beyond the seas in China and Japan there are thousands who have never heard the name of Christ?

To all such the Unitarian Church can by its nature have no message, any more than it has for the furious specialists, the people who pin their faith for the regeneration of the world to a particular prophet, or a single idea, Nietzsche or Mrs. Eddy, Beha Ullah or the Single Tax, Uncooked Food or Socialism, Materialism or Mormonism. Many of these people have qualities which any church might be glad to recognize and employ, the gift of enthusiasm, devotion, the ability to encounter ridicule, opposition, and material loss, for the sake of an idea. But all these fields are pre-occupied, preaching here is less than of no use, it is an impertinence, an interference with personal liberty whenever it tries to take people from the convictions they have, and instill into them those we would like them to have.

Contrasted with these is another class, a large body of people whom one is tempted to call the Comfortable People, who are often however the cause of much discomfort to others, who must encounter their enlightened selfishness. These people who are not alive on the religious side at all; preoccupied with their own concerns, and completely satisfied with themselves, they go about the world ministers of their own comfort, high priests and priestesses of the doctrine of laissez faire. Sometimes they are kindly people, who would rather do good to a neighbor than not, if the trouble were not too great, and often it does not seem as if they should be blamed for their condition any more than a man is blamed for color blindness or tone deafness. "Some souls have little intercourse with heaven, they have no ships upon the intervening seas." But the Church has necessarily nothing to offer them upon which they can set a value, and it may be confessed that they are people in whom it is difficult to be interested. Even the one person, who, seen through the veil of history, seems to have been able to be interested in everybody, would appear as having entertained but a dim enthusiasm for the "ninety and nine who need no repentance."

Setting aside all these areas which are already pre-empted, what are the possible fields of action for a liberal church? Are there any which lie white for the harvest? Any people on this continent who are in need, real need,

of what such a church has to give here and now?

In the first place the American continent is full of unchurched people, the working-people, who, except they be Catholics or Jews, no church ever touches, and it is also full of bad work, dishonest work, unwilling work, incompetent work. Could the Unitarian Church bring to the working people of America a right conception of religion, a right religiousness in work, it would renew the glory of the ages of faith without their supersitions and cruelties, the most glorious renaissance the world has ever seen would be brought to pass on the soil of this New World. But as the working people will not come to church, the only way is for the church to go to them. It will have to go to them, and prove itself their friend in quite practical and unromantic ways, such as fighting their battle against industrial principalities and powers, in order to obtain for them better houses to live in, purer air to breathe, more play places for their children out of school, and better training for the business of life in school. It will have to show its good will by definitely uniting itself with every agency which is struggling to make the world a better world for the unprivileged, to defend the defenceless, to substitute right enjoyments for disastrous ones, and health for disease. It will have to save the boys from the street corner rowdyism which ends in the penitentiary, and the girls from the life which is initiated behind the counters of good church members who pay their help $3.50 a week when the barest living costs twice as much, or in the kitchens of well-to-do women, where girls are paid a living wage, but are unclassed, and expected to live the life of the penitentiary or the nun's cell.

These are not romantic occupations, they are not scheduled in churchly constitutions, but they do indicate the places where religion is needed if it is ever to be the religion of the common life.

Once again in the history of the ages is the opportunity being extended to the Church to be the advocate and friend of the workers, to speak for them in the councils of the rich, a challenge never heeded, an opportunity never accepted, one would say as he glances down the pages of history, offered now in a new way, in a new era, and offered, it may be, for the last time. Better citizenship, this should be the war cry of the Church to our age, for, "What the poor need most from the cultured classes is not more neighborliness, but better citizenship; not so much altruism of volunteer personal service, as an income altruism that will create more favorable conditions of living; not so much personal sympathy for the misfortunes of one family as an intelligent understanding of the difficulties of many families."

Preachers, organizers, saints, these we need as always in our Church today, but also the world needs in the Church men who have a passion for humanity, the passion that will have the courage to deal with humanity in the mass, and the patience to deal with it in units.

And the units who make the minister's problems, and his vocation worth while, are, not the gay sinners of fiction and melodrama, but the disappointed people, the people who are discouraged through maladjustments of different kinds, the nerve-wracked people, in a word, the people of the common life.

Who are the disappointed people? Chiefly all who, being alive, have built themselves a house of dreams out of the unwoven fabric of life. To some it is no more than a bubble, gay with the evanescent colors of petty personal triumphs, of mean enjoyments, but to many its foundations go deep, built into the primal instincts and cravings of the soul. To the heart of youth hope is the natural travelling companion, whose song cheers the dreariest

day. The road is dull, the task distasteful, but wait! What there may be just around the corner! Those things for which the instincts of the nature crave, to which its fibres turn as the tendrils of the plant turn towards the light, as the wave creeps onward to the shore, the instinct for noble self-expression, for devoted service, for comprehending sympathy, for achievement, they are sure to be fulfilled by-and-by; it may come a little late, later than to some, but it will surely come, says hope, for what else is the value of life, what is the exacting business of existence meant for? Then comes autumn, the colors of the vision fade and pale, its outlines weaken, hope makes way for practical assurance, the vague expectation of sometime seeing the smiling face of life, to the sense that it is too late, to a knowledge of the unchangeable grayness of the days. Not both hands warm at the fire of life, but the faint glimmer of the will-o-the-wisp across twilit spaces is the common lot. Then is the time when geniuses write Books of Ecclesiastes and Rubaiyats, and ordinary people, if they are fortunate, turn to religion, stopping not to shiver in a world of empty negations, but building up their house of dreams in the faith that "earth has no sorrow which heaven cannot heal." It is good that religion should offer them refuge, best if that religion be one of practical helpfulness rather than ceremonial observance.

Then there are the nervous people—and how many Americans are there not among this category—who are always longing for help, consciously or unconsciously. One of them in telling of the agonies undergone by the strained mind in its unequal conflict with the rebellious body, says quite frankly, "If I had religious faith I believe I should get well. I can see what an immense help religious faith would be to a neurasthenic."

To speak of broken hearts is to-day unfashionably sentimental. "There is no God, the scoffer saith, but none there is no sorrow," wrote a poet sixty years ago now hopelessly out of date. But even yet if we but turn to statistics we find that there is an extraordinary number of people so uncomfortable in the world as to be ready to leave it in all sorts of violent ways. The statistics of all civilized countries show the most remarkable increase in the suicidal mania duing recent years, the rate of suicide having gone up in proportion as the rate of general mortality has gone down. In the year 1908 seven thousand persons took their own lives in the registration area of the United States, and the records of death by suicide show that the increase in Greater New York during the last forty-three years has been tenfold."

Disease, disappointment, business failure, unemployment, and sheer loneliness, are assigned as among the causes, but behind all these there is the problem of maladjustment. People are in the wrong places, and hopeless discouragement results. And the Protestant churches have no machinery, such as is provided by the Catholic confessional, for getting automatically in touch with discouraged souls, machinery which is effective to a certain extent, since the figures show that suicide is relatively rarer among Catholics than among Protestants.

Would it not be possible for a church unburdened by sectarian rites to evolve some system which might bring it in touch with discouraged people and enable it to help them over the bad place? For a church which teaches the divinity of man should be better able than others to teach man the way of self-reliance, and self-help.

Deep below the superficialities and trivialities of humanity lie two instincual fundamental cravings, the longing for sympathy and comprehension, and the craving after perfection. The new-born child adrift in an universe to which its sole response is helplessness fumbles blindly about it,

first, for a human touch, then towards the dawning sense of light. And it is so with the imprisoned human soul all the days of its life. Someone has justly observed that if the historic Jesus were to be proven a fallacy to-day, tomorrow he would be reconstructed out of the heart of humanity. And it would be so because in the historic presentment of Jesus of Nazareth is blent the response to these two unsatisfied, and unsatisfiable, needs of humanity, responsive sympathy to every human ill, which fills his story with healing suggestion, and the implication of perfection to which the torn soul of mankind, crucified between its ideals and its possibilities, clings as its one example of an ideal personified.

If we question the other great religion which has commanded the devotion of men again the thought is true. It was sympathy, a divine compassion, which drove Gautama Buddha out from his earthly Paradise, "the woeful cry of life and all flesh living," scourged him forth to find a remedy through desperate wrestling with the gods of the universe. And as that divine pity drew men towards him, so the Perfection which men ascribed as the result of his conflicts, held and holds them to him.

"I, if I be lifted up," said the Other Master, "will draw all men unto Me." As if the essentials of a helper of mankind were two, transcendence and a cross.

The Unitarian Church, if it is to be the religion of the future, must be lifted up as the agency of practical help in the problems of ordinary humanity, as well as be the prophet of ideal perfection. And the agency by means of which an individual or a society is lifted up as a redeemer is the agency of the Coss. Perhaps we have been too posperous in America. Perhaps the liberal church in the New World has not suffered enough to qualify it for its time of trial when it will have to decide whether it will accept new methods, and honor men who may not conform to its ideals, who may outrage its old-time standards, but who are passionately alive to the call and spirit of the age, alive as in their time Bruno and Huss were, or Savonarola or Socinus.

The Readjustment of the Modern Church

BY WILLIAM H. RAMSAY

During the past two or three years the churches of the United States have been subjected to unmerciful criticism by writers in various popular magazines, for their delinquencies and especially for their failure to adjust themselves to the social conditions and needs of modern society. The trouble with these articles is that they deal mainly with symptoms, and call attention to facts that have been recognized for some time by the discerning within the churches; and they probably help to increase the indifference and alienation from which the churches have been suffering. Anyway, the reform and readjustment of the churches must come from within. There are hopeful indications that such readjustment will be made, and indeed that the process has already begun. Such an indication is apparent in a number of very frank and thorough going articles that have been contributed to the leading theological magazines and church papers, by men of advanced ideals and courageous spirit, in the Universities and Theological Schools. These men are urging the supreme importance and vital need of a radical readjustment of religious thought and expression and method.

The number of such articles is

legion; and the men who write them are those who are exercising the most decisive influence upon the new generation of ministers.

Take e. g. the American Journal of Theology (published by the Theological Faculty of Chicago University). In the issues of that Journal for a single year (1909), I find three articles dealing in a very thorough-going way with this subject of reconstruction: "What the Church Has a Right to Demand in Theological Reconstruction," by Prof. Allen Hoben; "The Adjustment of the Church to the Psychological Condition of the Present," by Prof. James Hayden Tufts, and "Religious Persons," by Prof. Edward Scribner.

If we turn to the Hibbert Journal, we find a large proportion of the contribution devoted to the same subject. Such articles, i. e., as are by Prof. Arthur O. Lovejoy, of Washington University, St. Louis, on "Religious Transition and Ethical Awakening in America" (April, 1908), and a most searching and vigorous article on "Religion and our Schools,," by Prof. John Dewey, of Columbia University. Prof. Hoben frankly confesses that little or nothing is to be expected from the church in the way of deliberate change, because "the perennial attitude of the church is that of conservation." The initiative, he believes, must be taken by the disinterested professional theologian. "The whole army can not reconnoiter; and so it happens that the church is often found bravely holding positions, which being no longer strategic, or even necessary, unfortunately withhold her forces from participation in the vast and confident advance of modern thought" Reconstruction is a last resort, so the church is often found like the squatter whom twenty years of city growth has surrounded with urban condition, making the water from the old well in his yard even dangerous, and his flickering lantern quite unnecessary. The attitude of timidity and caution on the part of the church are easily explainable, and the motives that determine her attitude toward proposed innovation are laudable enough. "The church regards herself as holding a trusteeship for humanity, which forbods whatever seems to her a doubtful investment." The traditional program and methods justified themselves, in a way; they had vitality, in their day, at least; they provided a basis for propagandism, enthuiasm, loyalty and heroic service. The new program must promise as much along its own lines: it must guarantee militant and heroic qualities on a par at least with those which prevailed under the inspiration of the old beliefs. Moreover the New Theology must be able to supply a series of symbols consonant with modern culture. Suggestion and symbol are indispensible factors in social control, and in all mass movements; so that any reconstruction worthy of the name cannot remain abstract or esoteric, but must set up popular standards about which the people may rally. "The church has also a right to demand an adequate social message, a religious sanction or imperative which shall compel her to take a more intentional and significant part in the now conscious struggle of the masses for more just conditions of life. Mighty religious sanction must be applied which will inspire and control the profound demand for justice and the humanitarian sentiments of the great middle and sub-middle clases of society, for these are bound to force their way up and lay hold on their inheritance. It is open to the church to determine whether this whole movement of the people shall remain merely economic, or shall be made a factor in the higher and fuller spiritual life of the people. In the latter case the social movement will be the making of the church, and the church will be the making of the social movement: she will illuminate, temper, correct, sanction and exalt; it will create the very issues for lack of which the church is sinking into indolent obscurity.

Prof. James Hayden Tufts in his article on "The Adjustment of the Church to the Psychological Condition of the Present," makes a strong plea for the enlargement of the categories of religion, to make it cover or embrace the more complex and expanding mental and spiritual life of our age. The older orthodoxy expressed the religious relationship largely in terms of Sovereignty. The past century has shifted the emphasis in imagery from the conception of Sovereignty to that of Kinship: God is the divine Father, men are brothers. The type of religious experience has been affected by this shift of emphasis. The family relation appeals to the young, and probably more strongly to women than to men: it appeals to both men and women more in times of sorrow and discouragement than in times of war against the sins of passion or the fierce battle for the right. Both misconception, sovereignty and kinship—are permanent aspects of possible religious experience, and men will always find religious expression in the prayer: "Our Father which are in heven. Thy Kingdom come."

But these are not the only terms in which the divine may be imaged. Progress has brought the development of new institutions, new organizations, corresponding to more complex experiences and expanding mental and spiritual life.

"The two lines of activity and thought which are most characteristic of our time are: first, the organization of men for industry and business, and second, the promotion and application of science and education." Family relations keep their place as a part of life, but they are certainly not all. Prof Tufts points out that the modern industrial organization of society has created a new sort of relationship between man and his fellow men in which the principle of justice must receive a new application. The collective system with its enormously productive machine process, capable of freeing men from exhaustion and the drudgery of over-work, and of giving to the rank and file of workers more time and opportunity for the development of their human qualities; the fearful possibility of submerging the individual in a collective and impersonal whole and of making the machine master instead of servant: Here is the opportunity of a social service and an interdependence entirely distinct from that of a kinship or of political co-operation. The specific note of this new relationship is that it evokes the consciousness of rights, and, at its best, demands the rights of others. It presents the possibility of sacrificing the rights of others in freer fashion than family solidarity allowed.

It is often urged that the application of the formula of brotherhood would solve all our social and industrial problems. Prof. Tufts regards this as very doubtful, and urges that brotherhood does not place the emphasis where the modern man wants it placed, or where the economic process naturally requires..

"Brotherhood stands for sympath for give and take, for standing by in time of trouble; it does not take any careful reckoning of debit and credit. This is all needed in human society. But brotherhood does not most appropriately symbolize perfect fairness toward all men in relation, where it is not sympathy but justice that is wanted." Brotherhood suggests guidance by emotion rather than by reason.

These facts are presented, not to urge ministers to leave the field of ethical religion for that of economic discussion, but rather to suggest a much more fundamental change in attitude. "The Central fact" says Prof. Tufts, "is that if the preacher is to present religious truth as something vital he must make it mean something for the field in which it is now essentially an onlooker. To do this religion must identify itself with principles and conceptions which represent in these nelds the life of the spirit. . . . . In doing this we shall enlarge the categories of religion. We

must enlarge the conception of God and of religious experience, just as they have been enlarged when other ethical conceptions have been taken into religion.

The trained modern psychologist powerfully reinforces the position of the Social reformer in the article on "Non-Religious Persons," by Prof. Ed-Scribner Ames, in the American Journal of Theology. Religion is defined in terms of Social experience. Men are religious, not because of the posession of any "religious instinct," or "religious faculty," or because they have "a sense of the infinite," but **"because they are capable of developing the attitudes and habits which are religious."** The psychological criterion of a man's religion is the degree and range of his social consciousness; the extent to which he is a participator in the ideal values of the social life. One's conscience, or one's external authority is necessarily the living embodiment of some social system. The symbols which appeal to a man so powerfully may seem to him entirely beyond and above any social origin, and he may even resent the scientific conclusion that they are the products of the historic social life of the race. But to the psychologist it remains clear that the man is genuinely religious in so far as his symbols and ceremonials, institutions and heroes enable him to share in the social life.

The application of this psychological test to existing types of persons in modern society, and in churches, is exceedingly instructive and suggestive.

The application of any such test—and it is surely being applied widely today—is bound to produce fearful havoc with a great many of our religious assumptions. It calls for a radical reconstruction of the conception of the religious life.

A very important, but exceedingly difficult problem is suggested by the question: How can the modern church adapt its religious services—its symbols and liturgies to the new ideals that are being forced upon us by the modern conception of God and man and society?

A modern liturgy! The very expression is sufficient to repel a large number of religious persons. And yet the church must attempt the task of supplying, or compiling a modern ritual. She must make a beginning at all events. Almost all of the rituals and liturgies of churches at present in use are products of a passing social system, and of an order of religious conceptions that are no longer accepted by educated and thoughtful people.

It is very interesting to know that Rev. Stanton Coit has made a beginning with an ethical ritual that aims to express through literary and artistic symbols the new social idealism of the age,—what Dr. Coit calls "National Idealism." In two somewhat recent volumes—"National Idealism and a State Church," and "National Idealism and the Book of Common Prayer," Dr. Coit exploits his program of reconstruction in a most persuasive way. Dr. Coit is an enthusiast, filled with the divine fire of the new social spirit. His program of the modern church is a most inspiring one. How near or how possible, under existing ecclesiastical and political conditions in Great Britain, the realization of such an ideal may be, it would be foolish to even guess. But the world is moving rapidly today, and the poor old church has a hard task to keep herself adjusted to the changes that are taking place. Happy are they who have faith and enthusiasm enough to carry them joyously forward to the new opportunities and new tasks of the coming days.

———o———

NEWPORT, R. I.

Channing Memorial Church, Rev. William Safford Jones.—A sign of the growing sense of Christian fellowship between the two branches of Congregationalism in this community is the cordial invitation of the people of the United Congregational Church to Mr. Jones, to preach for them the first Sunday evening in March, their own minister being absent on sick leave.

The Relation of the Church and Politics

THIRD DINNER OF THE NEW YORK UNITARIAN CLUB

THE third meeting of the New York Unitarian Club was held as usual at the Hotel Manhattan, Wednesday evening, March 29. While the attendance was not as large as usual, the interest was certainly keen and the speaking most interesting.

The first speaker was Canon John P. Peters of St. Michael's Church, chairman of the Committee of Fourteen recently appointed to investigate certain phases of civic reform in New York City. In a delightfully informal and chatty way, Dr. Peters told of his own experiences in the civic service in connection with his own church. In America, he said, the problem of the clergyman's relation with politics is different from that in England or Germany. We have no State Church here; each Church stands in the integrity of its own independence; and the minister, while wisely refraining from definite participation in party politics, may freely use his influence as a leader in moral ideals to help shape public opinion in its movements affecting civic righteousness. He illustrated what he meant by the way in which virtual leadership in a movement for specific reform in his own section fell upon his church and upon him, irrespective of denomination affiliations or party connection, but directly because of the place which his church had won as a centre of moral and spiritual energy.

The second speaker was Rev. Adelbert Hudson of Boston, introduced as having peculiar interest to Unitarians of New York because he had been the immediate successor of our Mr. Slicer in Buffalo.

Mr. Hudson began by pleasant reference to his recent trip through the South, and his surprise at some things which he discovered on his return to Boston. In coming to New York, he said, one has a sort of feeling that he may expect anything; and so it is an extreme delight that in the subject of the evening the Church is put first, and politics second.

Just what do we mean by "the Church" and just what do we mean by "politics"? I take it that we do not mean by the Church the preacher alone. We are thinking of the Church Universal. We are thinking of it as the organized expression of man's religious ideals. And when we speak of politics we are not thinking of Taft or the Good Government Association, but what we have in mind is the attainment, up to date, of man's effort at self-government; and it becomes evident at once that the Church is concerned with ideals and Politics with facts and that there must be a very close relationship, but that that relationship ought to be clearly defined for the good of society for its best progress.

But we are met at once with a serious difficulty when we talk of the Church and its relationship to politics. I think we must honestly face the fact that the Church has little hold upon the masses of the thinking active men of the world. It does not touch their

lives. I am not inclined to say that this is all the fault of the Church. It may be that these men do not want the Church. They still think of the Church as something that has to do with future life—insures man eternal salvation. Men have simply lost track of religion. They don't know what religion has been doing for the last thirty or forty years. The Church has been conservative; but it has made progress. consequently in talking about the relations of the Church to politics we must have in mind that wise word of Dr. Everett to the students at the Divinity School, "Always use your influence for every good cause, but never use your influence until you get it." The Church has not much influence to-day. The Church must make itself known as a power in the world in its own high function. I realize that there are a great many good men in the world to-day that are doing great work in philanthropy and reform. Such men are apt to say, "To do good is my religion," but the influence of that impulse to do good comes from the influence of a mother or father who have bequeathed to these good men a tendency to do good deeds. They are doing business on borrowed religious capital.

Where do we get our moral ideals? We don't create them. They are not the result of education. The eternal "ought" is in the human heart. If you and I honestly believe in the thing that we talk so much about—the immanence of God—we believe that our conscience is the voice of God within us and it is the first function of religion to make the voice of God articulate and distinct in human hearts—to build up man's higher nature so that he is fitted to deal with the world's issues of the time.

Religion stands as the great source of moral impulse which shall work out through all the details of life, politics and elsewhere. The thing that is needed to-day is a better human nature, and the Church, as the organized expression of a man's religious ideals, should be the power to make human nature better than it is.

I think it extremely dangerous for a Church as an institution to interfere with politics. History has shown that. But the Church as a moral influence must make itself felt in politics or it must die. Politics is the vital expression of a man's effort at self-government. If the Church is true to its ideals it will go forth into the politics of the day and do the thing it has to do, and remember that the Church does not mean the ministry; the Church means the laity.

Organized democracy in this country is waiting for co-operation of a democratic Church. It is easy to indict our own churches of to-day and say they are not doing their duty; but they are doing much. The world is sensitive to-day as never before to the oppression of the weak. It seems to me that those that hold to-day the interests of humanity can do no better work than be united with heart and soul to build up the democratic church, whatever its name or form, so as to give it in the city and nation the power and vitality to help the world in achieving peace and righteousness.

The last speaker was Hon. Charles E. Littlefield, ex-Congressman from Maine, but at present living in New York, and an attendant at All Souls' Church. His address was vigorous, breezy, full of humor, and stirring in its appeal for the insistence of the ideals for which the Church stands in public affairs. Congress is very sensitive to public opinion, he said. Congressmen are very timid before the manifestation of the Church influence, when it is used wisely and effectively; and if the men of the Church were as eager about their business as the chieftains of Tammany Hall are about their business—at it three hundred and sixty-five and one-quarter days in the year, the moral forces of the nation could easily dominate politics to their abundant benefit.

The Modern Church and Social Justice

CONDUCTED BY REV. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Socialist Party

WHATEVER we may think of the economic philosophy of Socialism, or however much we may disagree with the political principles of the Socialist Party, one fact must at least be evident to us all—namely, that the Socialists constitute the only political organization in our country to-day which has any understanding of the social problem, and cherishes any vision of its possible solution. We may assent or dissent to the Socialists' diagnosis of the social evils of our time—we may agree or disagree as to the Socialists' specific remedy for the removal of these evils and their attendant causes—but we have to admit, with however great a degree of reluctance, that the Socialists comprise the only political party which really sees the terrible situation now existing in our modern industrial civilization, and tries to meet this situation without compromise of evasion.

One only has to study for a moment the activities of the Republican and Democratic parties, and gain acquaintance with their chosen leaders, to understand with perfect clearness that both of these organizations are mere survivals of an age that has long since passed away, and together "lag superfluous" upon the stage of American politics. They represent principles of national life which are as antiquated as the stage coach and the post-rider—they are wrestling with issues which are as dead as the Moabites and the Philistines—and they cherish ideals, in so far as they can be said to have any ideals at all, which are as anomalous to-day as Don Quixote's ideals were in his. The only problems which appear to either of them to be real are mere problems of improved party machinery, and the only achievements which seem to them to be worth while are the winning of victories on the political battle-field, with their resulting booty of public office. As for the social problem, which is the one all-important question of the hour, neither the Republican nor the Democratic party seems to know that there is any such problem clamoring for attention. Read the political platforms formulated by these two parties in the last Presidential campaign, and where, in any of even their most casual phrases, is there any reference to those stupendous questions of capital and labor which are threatening the very stability of the republic, or to that crying social injustice which is stirring the awakened conscience of our people to the very depths? Imagine, if we can, some historian of the national life, a century or two hence, studying these utterances of Republicanism or Democracy—supposed from their very nature to be clear reflections of contemporary events and issues—for enlightenment upon the political problems of the present hour; and what idea would he ever have that, in this year 1911, there were such matters before us as industrial accidents, women's rights, tuberculosis and other preventable diseases, infant mortality, tenements, congestion of population, living wages, poverty, crime, excessive wealth, industrial feudalism, and so on indefinitely? In so far as the Republican and Democratic parties are conscious of these issues at all, they see in them only so many popular whims to be placated, or so many mad attacks upon the rights of property, the stability of investments, and the privileges of capital, to be rigidly suppressed. That is why, in the face of any living problem, forced by an indignant public senti-

ment upon the organized political mind, the leaders of these two old-time parties stand shoulder to shoulder in opposition to the threatened innovation. That is why, whichever party may chance to be in power, all bills for children's bureaus, health bureaus, minimum wage boards, eight-hour days, reforms of taxation, relief of living conditions, woman suffrage, etc., slumber peacefully in committee pigeon-holes, or are reported out, only to be defeated by the bi-partisan combines. That is why, in the ultimate analysis, it is difficult to see wherein there is any fundamental difference between these two organizations in matters which represent anything more vital than the traditional conflicts of the last two generations. At the best indifferent, at the worst hostile, to the social demands of the present day—this is the attitude of both the Republican and Democratic parties!

The only possible exception which can be taken to this sweeping indictment is that which may be found in the present remarkable upheaval in the Republican party, which has crystallized within a month into what is known as the Progressive Republican League, and which shows clearly that there is still left in that organization some of that spirit of noble humanitarian idealism which made it great in the days of Lincoln and Sumner. Here, in such men as La Follette, Cummins, Bristow, Beveridge, Pinchot and Garfield, do we have brave and far-sighted leaders; and here, in such proposals as those for direct primaries, the initiative, referendum and recall, the popular election of Senators, the conservation of natural resources, etc., do we have measures directly aimed toward the accomplishment of political democracy. But one sees, even in the purposes of this League, not much more than a democratizing of the machinery of government for the quicker and surer expression of the popular will; and certainly, when one advances beyond the field of politics into that of industry, and looks for some sweeping policy of fundamental social change, based upon a clear apprehension of existing social injustice, one looks in vain. At present, the insurgency movement, fine as it is, is political and not social in its nature, and in so far as it is more than this, it represents a type of radicalism which can never find any permanent place within the existing Republican organization.

It is only when we turn to Socialism that we find a political party which is really alive to the crying social evils of the time, and which really attempts to grapple with these evils in some constructive way. Here the old watchwords fail, and the old issues find no place. Here the traditional lines of party division disappear, and the familiar appeals to party loyalty are silenced. Here is an organization which faces modern conditions, deals at first hand with modern problems, and seeks no lower or less fundamental end than the complete emancipation of humanity from the binding injustice of modern social arrangements. Here is a party which dares to write a platform which seems to have some relation at least to the actual facts of modern life, and to express in some form at least the social ideals which dominate the noblest minds and most unselfish hearts of the present generation. Thus it is in the Socialist platform alone that we find demands definitely formulated "for shorter days of labor and increase of against accident, sickness, and lack of wages; for the insurance of workers employment; for pensions for aged and exhausted workers; for the public ownership of the means of transportation, communication and exchange . . . for the complete education of children, and their freedom from the workshop . . . for the free administration of justice . . . for equal suffrage of men and women," etc., etc. It is the Socialist party alone which dares to deny the privilege of wealth,

to challenge the equity of unrestricted private ownership, to set the sanctity of life ever against the sanctity of property, to question the dogma of the infallibility of the courts, to announce the inalienable rights of labor to enjoy the fruits of labor, to take seriously the sacred doctrine of human equality, to denounce war and seek peace, to proclaim that the common welfare of all the people and not the security of the property of a few of the people is the true end of organized government. The Socialists, of course, are not the only people who believe these things. As Miss Jane Addams has so well said, "The study of social conditions and the obligation to eradicate poverty cannot belong to one political party nor to one economic school." But, while all this is true, there is still no gainsaying the fact that the Socialist party is the only organized political force in American life which is specifically dedicated to the attainment of these ideals.

Now, here, to my mind, is a fact which must never be forgotten in our consideration of Socialism. More than any other single force, it is awakening the slumbering conscience of the American people, and identifying politics with life. It is pointing, morning, noon and night, to the stupendous injustice of mdoern life; and it is insisting, morning, noon and night, that it is the business of the government to cure this injustice. To the Socialists' indictment of the conditions of our industrial civilization there is no answer save that of absolute assent; and certainly, to the Socialists' remedy for these conditions, there is also no answer save the formulation of an alternative policy of social reconstruction more feasible and more just. Some of us are still doubtful of the wisdom of the Socialist remedy—some of us are still doubtful of the soundness of the underlying economic theories of Socialism—and many of us feel that the present leadership of the Socialist Party is not altogether helpful. But many of us are at the same time convinced, in spite of all our reservations, that the time has passed by when the Socialists can be "pooh-poohed" as dreamers of vain Utopias, or assailed as enemies of social order. Alone of all existing parties, they see the present problem and are trying to solve it constructively; and they therefore constitute the only genuine humanitarian force in American politics to-day. Many of us are still hoping that there will soon appear a third party which shall be rid of those hard and fast doctrinaire elements which still tend to make Socialism a faction rather than a movement, a sect rather than a religion—a party which shall unite Republicans, Insurgents, Bryanites, Single-Taxers, labor unionists, social workers, and the Socialists themselves, into one great organization of radical reform, and accomplish for industrial slavery what early Republicanism accomplished for shattel slavery. But failing this, or until this comes, it is becoming more and more obvious that Socialism, for better or worse, must challenge the allegiance of every true friend of human progress.

NOTE.

In the last issue of The Unitarian Advance in this department I said, "Sixteen out of the twenty-seven students at the Meadville Theological School belong to the Socialist party. They carry the red card in their pockets and have organized a local branch of the Intercollegiate Society." I desire herewith to retract this statement in toto, and to express my deep regret that it should have appeared. When I was in Meadville during the recent Convocation Week, I was told of the organization in the school of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, was shown the charter of the Society with the names of its sixteen members and attended an informal meeting at which Mr. John

Spargo, then lecturing in the town, was the guest of honor. I inferred at once without question and, as now appears, without warrant, that the members of the Intercollegiate were also members of the Socialist Party. This inference was not wholly without reason, as I have long been familiar with the fact that the number of Socialists in our colleges and universities is oftentimes reckoned on the basis of the membership of the local Intercollegiate societies; and as I myself have only recently declined membership in the New York Intercollegiate on the ground that I was not a member of the party. In declining this invitation I expressly stated that I should be glad to join if non-Socialists were received into membership. I have never been informed, however, that this was the case, and as a result I am still outside the organization. I mention these facts not to excuse but to explain my statement. What I should have done was to have stated the facts regarding Meadville and not the inference from the facts: and nobody regrets more than myself that I failed to do this.

I desire to apologize herewith to the students and faculty of the school, especially to the members of the local Intercollegiate. I have done everything possible to recall my statement. I am retracting it in my private correspondence and have written letters of retraction to The Register, Unity and Hhe Pacific Unitarian. If there is more that I can do to atone for the grievous injustice which I have done, I shall be glad to act.

———o———

Editor of The Unitarian Advance.

AS Secretary of the Meadville Theological School Chapter of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, I feel it my duty to correct some statements made by Mr. Holmes in ris department of The Modern Church and Social Justice last month, which were hardly exact, and therefore misleading. Mr. Holmes says, "Sixteen out of the twenty-seven students at the Meadville Theological School this year, or more than 50 per cent., belong to the Socialist party. They carry the red card in their pockets and have organized a local branch of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society."

The School Chapter of the I. S. S. was organized October 23, 1910, at the instance of men who have the Socialsit cause at heart, for the purpose of making an impartial study of Socialism and stimulating enthsiasm among those who are deeply stirred with a desire for social justice. Its membership is limited to those who, in the words of the founders of the society, "regard the aims and fundamental principles of Socialism with sympathy." The meetings of the Chapter (except those concerned immediately with business) are open to all interested in Socialism. Our membership is fourteen, counting two alumni who are honorary members. The student enrollment of the school, counting the two Cruft Fellows who graduated last year, numbers only twenty-six. Of the I. S. S. Chapter not all, but only a few, are dues-paying members of the Socialist party and carry a red card. It could not be said that all are Socialists in any strict sense of the word, one at least would not accept that designation.

I feel that this explanation is due to those of our members who are loyal members of the Chapter, and who have deep sympathy with the principles and aspirations of the Socialist movement, but who for various reasons do not carry a red card and are not therefore members of the Socialist party.

WM. E. BINGHAM,
Secretary.

SYMPOSIUM

Is it wise to encourage the formation of All Souls (Universalist-Unitarian) churches in communities where no liberal church now exists and where a merging of Universalist and Unitarian forces might make one possible.

Rev. Frank O. Hall, D.D., Minister of The Church of the Divine Paternity, N. Y.

I am glad to join in the symposium in the Unitarian Advance on the question you have stated. I feel strongly that it is not only wise to encourage such union movements, under the circumstances indicated, but that it is wrong for us not to do so. My conscience has long troubled me when I have appealed to the loyalty of Universalists to contribute toward the support of some missionary movement in a community where there were two liberal churches duplicating each other's work, each kept alive by outside gifts, when if they would get together they might not only be self-supporting, but actually be a help to some other struggling church. It has seemed to me that such an appeal is like getting money under false pretenses, and that if I were to state the whole case with entire frankness people would not give at all.

As a matter of fact, we all know that Unitarian and Universalist churches have come to stand for essentially the same great fundamental religious principles. This is also true of a good many, still so-called "orthodox," Congregational churches, but it is especially true of the two churches under consideration. This is not the time to inquire how this came about, but the fact is, as Dr. J. T. Sunderland has admirably stated in his sermon on "Universalism and Unitarianism," that the Universal Religion, for which the Universalist Church has come to stand, and the Eternal Unities for which the Unitarian Church has come to stand, are one and the same thing:

One God: The Universal Father.

Religion One: Universal Religion.

Unity of Humanity: Universal Brotherhood.

Unity between Reason and Faith: Universal Revelation and Inspiration.

Unity in the Universe: Universal Salvation. We must all be saved together, or not at all.

And so on and on through the whole range of Unities and Universals. The fact is that we are running on parallel tracks. The average hearer with his eyes shut could not tell whether he were in a Universalist or a Unitarian church unless th preacher proclaimed the fact. Under such circumstances it seems to me the simplest common sense that people who think alike should get together and work together for the cause which they hold in common.

We see this with perfect clearness when we contemplate a community in which there are two varieties of Methodist or Baptist churches working at cross purposes, or even where there is a struggling Methodist church running opposition to a struggling Baptist church. "Why do not these silly people forget their petty differences of origin and history and get together for the good of both?" we ask. We easily recognize the wastefulness and wickedness of asking people to support as missionary enterprises such an unseemly rivalry, when there is so much that ought to be done and might be done by a union of forces. Why should we not apply the same rule to the liberal churches of the United States?

I expect to witness within the near future a great re-organization of the forces of the religious world. In that re-organization it may be that the noble names, Unitarian and Universalist will be lost. Names matter little. But

there is going to be a re-alignment. Every one feels that this is something very much to be desired. Our two churches are in a position to make a valuable contribution to this end. The way for us to make such contribution is indicated by your question. I vote in the affirmative.

FRANK O. HALL.

Rev. Frederick A. Bisbee, D. D., editor of the Universalist Leader

You ask: "Is it wise to encourage the formation of All Souls' (Universalist-Unitarian) churches in communities where no liberal church now exists, and where a merging of Universalist and Unitarian forces might make one possible?"

And I answer, No. At least, not yet. And here are some of my reasons.

I yield to no one in the spirit of fellowship with my Unitarian brethren; I yield to no one in my desire for more friendly relations and closer co-operation between the two denominations, but I am firmly convinced by observation and experiment that the efforts which have been made and which are contemplated, to bring about a merger, are unpolitic, unwise and tend to defeat the very object which they seek.

If it were possible to induce a half dozen men in each of the two denominations to stop talking for a period of five years, we should easily come to a wise solution of this vexed question! Religious unity was never yet made by fiat; it grows. To try to pick the fruit before the buds have unfolded into blossoms is both selfish and childish.

The whole proposition is illogical in the extreme. It is contended that because we are so much alike, we should come together and form a dual organization; when if we are so much alike there is not the slightest reason for organic union, for where the Unitarian church exists, the Universalists should go and enter into its life, and where the Universalist church exists the Unitarian should go and enter into the church life. If we are really serious and honest in our contention that we are alike, then we do not need any merger in the form of a two-headed freak!

But we are not alike, and our differences are our glory and not our shame, if we but knew enough to take advantage of the opportunity they afford us. We differ in origin, in tradition, in history, in appeal and in method. The Unitarian Church sprang from the cultured class, the Universalist from the common people; the Unitarian Church is aristocratic, the Universalist, democratic. Yet both are liberal, and each supplements the other; each does a work and reaches a people the other cannot. What, therefore, can be more absurd than to try to cut their utility in half by consolidation?

The idea that a greater work can be done by the one than by the two churches, is not sustained by history; whatever may be the immediate results, within a very few years the society drops to the average of one or the other of the original churches and becomes simply a denominational church. This is the fact, and it is the height of foolishness not to recognize it. The results so far attained do not justify any further experiments at the present time. However much we mary desire church unity, and we all do, this is not the way to secure it.

Furthermore, there are many material considerations which make it impossible to carry out the proposed schemes, and the continuous irritation which is engendered destroys efficiency. If those who are so eager to "get churches quick" would expend one-half the time and energy in hard work they now spend in philandering with their neighbors, they would build more churches and do more good in the world than they can ever hope to acquire in any other way.

The world is big enough for both churches, and the world needs both churches, and what is needed is sim-

ply that we play a fair game, and help each other to win in our own fields. When the committees were appointed to secure co-operation and avoid duplication, we took a step in the right direction, and it is to the shame of both churches that the committees proved their incompetence. They should have provided that one or the other church should go into new territory and that the support of the Liberal element of that community should be given to that church. But let it be either a Unitarian or a Universalist church and not a pathetic exhibition of ecclesiastical Siamese twins of no use save to gratify a morbid curiosity.

Let both churches go to work in worshipping God and serving humanity and stop scheming for results we have not earned, and in hearty co-operation we shall advance the Liberal cause to a position of honor and influence. FREDERICK A. BISBEE.

Rev. Clarence R. Skinner, minister of the Universalist Church in Mt. Vernon, N. Y.

I have been asked to contribute a few words to the discussion on the advisability of forming "All Souls'" churches by merging the Unitarian and Universalist denominations in new fields.

For me there is but one answer—by such co-operation all is to be gained and nothing is to be lost.

Those who have the larger purview of age and experience will doubtless make the plea of practical difficulties of administration. But I have noticed that the new churches in the missionary field now being supported by the separate denominations, do not lack an abundance of difficulties. In some quarters, difficulty seems to be the chief crop. As a matter of fact, I can think of no obstacles which would not be lessened by a united effort on the part of the two sister denominations. The church would gain in prestige, it would make a broader appeal, and it would have a larger financial backing.

But we should look at this question not only from the practical point of view. It is a question of principle. The people of both faiths ardently believe in the liberal interpretation of religion and the absolute freedom of conscience in worship. We believe in that splendid text of Abraham Lincoln, "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity."

The merger movement, therefore, is merely a logical outcome of our fundamental tenets. If we preach liberality, why not practice it? We all deplore the loss of power which has been occasioned by the splitting and wrangling of the sects of Christianity. Today a great social crisis is calling for a united moral force. How can we hope for any large and effective unity when we ourselves are not willing to take the first steps?

I believe in the merger because I think it is the only consistent and logical sequence of our faiths.

I believe in it also because it means the conservation of ministerial supply. The cry of all denominations is for more men. Perhaps this will be the necessity that will invent unity. Our aloofness is a ruinous waste of force. No business man would allow such conditions to exist were he facing a dearth of workers. The duplication of our Gospel shops in new cities is to be deplored. It cannot continue much longer, for we have not men enough to man all the citadels where the faith is now established.

If we cannot find more men, let us conserve those we have.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

Rev. Frederic W. Perkins, D.D., minister of the First Universalist Church, Lynn, Mass.

I believe thoroughly in the formation of "All Souls' churches" in communities where no liberal church now exists, by merging the Universalist and Unitarian forces in a single local organization. I believe in it because

the enterprise is so splendid a challenge to the "liberalism" and the Christianity of which both churches profess to be exponents. It will succeed in a given case only when both the Universalists and the Unitarians involved really possess more genuine Christianity than a liberal church of the conventionally denominational sort needs in order to succeed in a certain outward and material way. That fundamental condition must be frankly recognized at the outset. The movement will not succeed merely as an economic device for saving the expense of two buildings and two sets of salaries. It will not succeed as a bi-partisan scheme for gaining sectarian advantage; setcarian liberals can be as jealous of each other within a single church as when set apart in rival churches, and merging under such conditions marks no spiritual advance. Neither will it succeed if the union is committed in a spirit of intellectual compromise, on the assumption that men can preserve unity and keep the theological peace only by ceasing to cherish their convictions and to affirm them candidly even when they diverge. But such a union church will succeed, and nobly succeed, when it grows out of a loyalty to the Kingdom of God that is deeper, more inclusive, more ardent, and more compelling than any denominational loyalty, however precious a heritage that may individually be. Men and women whose vital working creed, spoken or unspoken, is, "I believe in God the Father, in the conquering leadership of Christ, in the supreme worth and power of the Kingdom of God," can worship and work together in a church that is the institutional expression of that common living faith. That is the faith that makes Universalists and Unitarians useful when organized in separte churches, and it is large enough to include them and dynamic enough to fuse them when they are organized in the same church. The success of such a church means a larger success for genuine Christianity. That makes it possible in spite of the difficulties, if Christianity is the invincible force we assert it to be. We can have an All Souls' Church if we have an all souls' spirit—and it is worth having.

FREDERIC W. PERKINS.

Rev. Frederick R. Griffin, Church of the Messiah, Unitarian, Montreal, Canada.

The fact that two groups of people hold siimlar theological opinions is not in itself a sufficient reason for consolidation. One group may be genuinely consecrated to great and vital human interests while the other may be alone concerned with the perpetuation and extension of particular doctrines which are at best of secondary importance. A union of two such groups could have little value.

If, however, the two groups have interests in common touching the imperative task of all churches, the strengthening of religious hope and faith, the pursuit of the ideal and an intelligent service of the needs of the modern world, then a merger should prove of great value. It should be understood that such a consolidation requires tact, breadth of mind and leadership of commanding purpose.

Before organic unity is effected in any locality it is highly desirable that the two congregations demonstrate their willingness and ability to work hamoniously together. Unitarians and Universalists have much in common, but strangely enough there has been very little co-operation and fellowship between them. An Unitarian church often has closer relations with a neighboring Congregational church than with the Universalist church of the same place. This is most unfortunate and is a condition to be corrected. When the two denominations as a whole have developed stronger ties it will be much more natural and much easier for two local congregations to consolidate.

My own experience as minister for eight years and a half of a merger

church offered little light. The church in Braintree, Mass., has very few Universalist families, not more than ten per cent. of the whole and hence is not a typical union church, but the experience offered many opportunities for discovering that Universalists are as ready to do their part and just as much in earnest and as devoted to the best things as Unitarians, while the effect upon the community was to increase its respect for the spirit and purpose of both peoples.

For the present I believe that local conditions should govern all proposed mergers, while for larger co-operation in the future the two denominations should know each other better. As a practical suggestion for the realization of this end, why not open a Department of Universalist Interests in "The Advance," and invite a Universalist to edit it?

FREDERICK R. GRIFFIN.

Rev. Howard C. Ives, recently minister of All Souls' Church (Universalist-Unitarian) New London, Conn.

The whole question of the advisability of local merging of the Unitarian and Universalist movements in a given community must be reduced to the question of What is the purpose of the Liberal Church?, and then to a question of methods, ways and means, expediency of management to attain the results wished. All churches are aiming, more or less intelligently, at the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth. But the so-called orthodox churches aim to do this by saving the individual out of the mass, and gradually establishing another group which shall be the saints as opposed to the sinners, and the saints are to rule forever and forever.

The liberal churches are broadly based on an entirely different conception. Their leaders teach, more or less clearly and forcibly, that Man is inherently divine, and that all men are destined to be made into the image and likenuess of God through the renewing power of righteousness.

At present, judging by the membership of the two wings of Christianity, the orthodox people far outnumber the liberals, yet judging by what is universally accepted by the average rational man, the position of the liberals, in its broad lines and fundamental position, is held by practically all educated, earnest, thoughtful people everywhere. The one thing necessary now is to amalgamate the heterogeneous mass of liberal people into some union that will be effective in the work of turning this kingdom of selfishness and evil into the Kingdom of brotherhood an drighteousness.

Now here we have right at our hand two organizations with the same fundamental aims and ideals. Both are numerically and financially weak. How can we make an effective plea for the strong unification of the forces of righteousness and freedom when the two units already established remain divided? I am not now making a plea for the complete amalgamation of the two national bodies, though personally I believe that will ultimately prove advisable. But in the meanwhile the wisdom of organizing merged movements in new communities, and combining the two forces in those communities where they are already established, is unquestionable. The advantage is threefold. In the first place, though of the least importance actually, the financial strength of the movement will be considerably augmented. Whatever funds can be raised for both will be turned into a single channel. In the second place, the effect on the public opinion of the community will be considerable. The great criticism of church methods advanced by the man in the street is that they are unbusinesslike, unscientific and medieval. He sees unification of forces, reduction of expense and minimizing of competition constantly going on in the business world, while the business which claims to be the most

important of all, the building of God's Kingdom on earth, and the uplifting of human character, clings to methods which have proved to be ruinous and ineffective. Let him see signs that the children of light are learning wisdom of the children of this world, and in spite of himself his interest will be aroused. But the most important advantage lies in the fact that such a merging of forces tends inevitably toward the belittling of sectarianism. It is in effect to say to the community in which this merger is made, "We wish to prove to you that we care nothing at all for the name we go under, or the doctrine professed. What we want is results. Come with us. Believe as you wish or must, but let us all work together to make human life more beautiful, the human soul more sweet and sane and worthful, and to build right here and now in this very community of ours a little corner of God's righteousness and peace."

HOWARD C. IVES.

ANNIVERSARY WEEK, BOSTON.

MAY 22—26, 1911

Preliminary Programme

MONDAY, MAY 22.

9 A. M. Morning prayer in King's Chapel, conducted by Rev. F. M. Bennett of Lawrence, Kan.

10.30 A. M. Annual meeting of the Ministerial Union in Channing Hall. Address by Rev. A. M. Rihbany, "The Oriental Christ and the Western World."

2.30 P. M. Public meeting of the National Alliance of Unitarian and Other Liberal Christian Women at the South Congregational Church. Greeting by Rev. Edward Cummings. Devotional service led by Rev. Margaret B. Barnard of Rowe. Addresses by Rev. Elizabeth Padgham of Rutherford, N. J.: "The Church and the Growing Girl"; Rev. F. A. Weil of Bellingham, Wash.: "Where Unitarianism is Still New;" and Rev. F. R. Griffin, Montreal, Can.: "Unitarian Work in a Conservative Community."

5 P. M. Vesper service at the First Church, corner Berkeley and Marlboro streets. Rev. Sydney B. Snow of Concord, N. H., in charge.

8 P. M. Public reception to ministers, delegates and friends at the Hotel Somerset. President and Mrs. Samuel A. Eliot, President and Mrs. Morton D. Hull, President and Mrs. William I. Lawrance, will receive.

TUESDAY, MAY 23.

9 A. M. Morning prayer in King's Chapel. The service will be in commemoration of the ministers of the Unitarian Fellowship who have died during the year. The address will be given by Rev. Edward Hale of Chestnut Hill.

10 A. M. Annual business meeting of the National Alliance of Unitarian and Other Liberal Christian Women in the South Congergational Church. Election of officers and annual reports.

10.30 A. M. Meeting of the Berry Street Conference in the Second Church, Copley Square. Address by Prof. N. P. Gilman of Meadville, Pa., on "Socialism." Open to ministers only.

2.30 P. M. Eighty-sixth annual business meeting of the American Unitarian Association in Tremont Temple.

The afternoon session will begin with a devotional service conducted by Rev. F. S. C. Wicks of Indianapolis. Introduction of business and resolutions and the appointment of committees. Annual reports of the Secretary and the Treasurer. Greetings by Rev. Matthew R. Scott of Leeds, England, and others. The meeting will close with the President's annual address, subject, "What We Might Oo Together—a Practical Ideal."

5 P. M. Vesper service at the First Church. Rev. John Baltzly of Hudson, Mass., in charge.

7.30 P. M. Anniversary sermon before the American Unitarian Association in Tremont Temple. The services will be conducted by Rev. John H. Lathrop of Brooklyn, N. Y., and the sermon will be preached by Rev. Samuel M. Crothers, D.D., of Cambridge.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 24.

9 A. M. Morning prayer in King's Chapel. The service will be conducted by Rev. Abbott Peterson of Lancaster, Mass.

10 A. M. Annual business meeting of the American Unitarian Association in Tremont Temple. Devotional service conducted by Rev. John W. Cooper, Ph.D., of Lancaster, Pa. Report of Nominating Committee. Election of officers and directors. Report of the Commission of the Church and the Social Question. Report of the Business Committee.

2.30 P. M. Annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association (continued) in Tremont Temple. The business will be concluded and brief addresses will then be made on "The Work in the Field," Rev. A. L. Hudson: "The Southwest"; Rev. J. E. Wright: "The Northwest"; Rev. A. R. Vail: "The Middle West"; Rev. A. S. Garver: "The Southeast."

5 P. M. Vesper service at the First

Church. Rev. Albert R. Vail of Urbana, Illinois, in charge.

7.30 P. M. Public meeting of the American Unitarian Association, under the auspices and direction of the Unitarian Club of Boston. A layman't meeting. The floor will be reserved for men. The galleries will be open to the public. Dr. Charles W. Eliot will preside. Rev. U. G. B. Pierce, Chmaplain of the United States Senate, will lead the devotional meeting. Addresses will be made by prominent laymen.

THURSDAY, MAY 25.

9 A. M. Morning prayer in King's Chapel. The service will be conducted by Rev. Edwin M. Slocombe of Augusta, Me.

10.30 A. M. Eighth annual meeting of the Unitarian Historical Society in King's Chapel. President Henry H. Edes will preside. Reports and election of officers. Addresses by Rev. Charles E. Park and Rev. Charles W. Wendte, D.D.

11 A. M. Annual meeting of the Fellowship for Social Justice in the vestry of the Second Church, Copley Square. Address by the President, report of the Secretary, election of officers and transaction of business.

12.30 P. M. Annual meeting and luncheon of the Meadville Alumni Association in the Bulfinch Place Church. Lunch at 1, to be followed by business meeting and addresses.

2 P. M. Annual business meeting of the Young People's Religious Union, in the vestry of the South Congregational Church, for reports, election of officers and conference.

5 P. M. Vesper service at the First Church, Rev. Arthur B. Whitney of Plymouth, Mass., in charge.

5-7 P. M. Reception by the Boston Federation of Young People's Religious Unions to the officers of the National Union in the parlors of the South Congregational Church. A collation will be served, and delegates and representatives from the Unions and Young People's Societies are invited.

7.30 P. M. Public meeting of the Young People's Religious Union in the South Congregational Church. Addresses on (1) "Our Wide Field"; (2) "The Work of Student Assistants"; (3) "Co-operation in Religious Education." Special music.

FRIDAY, MAY 26.

9 A. M. Morning prayer in King's Chapel. The service will be conducted by Rev. F. A. Weil of Bellingham, Wash.

10 A. M. Annual meeting of the Laymen's League in Canning Hall.

10 A. M. Annual meeting of the Unitarian Sunday School Society, King's Chapel. Service of song and prayer. 10.15 A. M. Reports of officers: the Treasurer, Mr. R. C. Humphreys; the Chairman of the Nominating Committee, Mr. J. H. Edwards; the Chairman of the Committee on Publicity, Rev. C. W. Casson; the Chairman of the Committee on Policy, Rev. J. C. Jaynes; and the President's annual address.

11.30 A. M. Address by Rev. F. S. C. Wicks, followed by discussion.

12.30 P. M. Intermission.

2.30 P. M. Opening session of afternoon meetings, transaction of unfinished business, to be followed by a conference of workers. Addresses by Rev. Joseph A. Puffer, Mr. F. W. Cooke, Jr., and Rev. F. J. Gauld, on "The Boy Scout Movement, Its History and Development." A Story Telling Hour. Introduction by Miss Lucy T. Poor, followed by Mrs. H. C. Parker, Miss F. M. Darnm, Rev. R. F. Leavens and Mrs. J. B. Carpenter.

10.00 A. M. Forty-fourth annual meeting of the Free Religious Association, at Ford Hall. General topic: "The Next Step." 1. Opening address of the President of the Association, Charles W. Wendte of Boston. 2. "The Next Step in Religion," by Algernon S. Crapsey of Rochester, N. Y. 3. "The Next Step in Philosophy," by Merle St. Croix Wright of New York. 4. "The Next Step in Social Development," by Anna Garlin Spencer of New York. 5. "The Next Step in Civil Government," by Joseph H. Walker of Brookline, Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives.

1 P. M. Dinner at the Twentieth Century Club, 3 Joy street. Tickets for the dinner, at one dollar each, can be obtained by mail from Miss Grace Hart, 25 Beacon street. No tickets will be sold after noon on Friday.

2 P. M. Memorial tribute to Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, former Vice-President of the association. Brief addresses by Mrs. Florence Kollock Crooker of Boston; F. B. Sanborn of Concord, and Mrs. John Elliott of Boston.

2.30 P. M. John Haynes Holmes will preside. Addresses by Rev. Charles W. Casson of Boston; Rev. Frederic W. Perkins of Lynn; Rev. Ida C. Hultin of Sudbury; Rev. Abraham M. Rihbany, Mr. George Clarke Fox and Rabbi Charles Fleischer of Boston, and others.

5 P. M. Vesper service at the First Church, Rev. F. R. Sturtevant of Dorchester, Mass., in charge.

6 P. M. Unitarian Festival in Tremont Temple. Speakers to be announced.

———o———

NEW ENGLAND LETTER.

"This is the closing meeting of the year" is the characteristic comment which appears at this season upon the announcements of various denominational gatherings. It was

fitting that the final meeting of the Boston Sunday School Union should be held at the Barnard Memorial, since that institution, under the devoted leadership of Mr. McDaniel, stands as an embodiment of what the various speakers at the meetings of the Union during the winter have been saying what ought to be done. There was special appropriateness between the topic of the address, by Mr. Oscar C. Gallagher, of the Disciples' Sunday School, on "Training Children in Social Service," and the building in which the meeting was held, and entirely apart from the value of the paper, one felt that the atmosphere of the place indicated the real value of the enterprises in which it is engaged. Incidentally it was reported at the business meeting at which officers for next year were elected, that the plan of meeting in different churches commends itself to those who attend the meetings, and the chances are that a similar plan will be adopted next year. Record breaking attendance and the discussion of a matter of widest interest characterized the meeting of the Unitarian Club of Boston on the 12th of April. The general topic for the evening was "A National Church at the National Capital.." The directors of the American Unitarian Association have recently appropriated the sum of eighty-five thousand dollars to assist in the building of a new church in Washington. This meeting was held to explain to the ministers and laymen in and about Boston the evidence upon which the directors felt justified in appropriating this large sum of money. The precise local needs of the society in Washington, together with its plans and a statement of the reasonable hope for the future if these plans could be carried out, were explained by Mr. Albert H. Decker of the Washington church. Mr. George Hutchinson explained the reasons of the board for feeling that the appropriation was completely justified from a financial point of view. Senator Chandler, from New Hampshire, expressed great confidence in the present administration of the Washington Church, and Hon. John D. Long, looking at the situation from many points of view, felt that a critical opportunity had presented itself for nationalizing Unitarianism. In spite of the development of a large amount of enthusiasm, as well as the fact that the meeting passed a resolution approving of the action of the Board of Diretcors, it was apparent from certain remarks at the close of the meting that many persons went away unconvinced.

The last meeting of the Newton Unitarian Club for the year was held on the evening of the 20th of April, after a most successful season. This organization includes in its membership men who are affiliated with the three Unitarian churches of Newton, and is one of the largest clubs in the vicinity of Boston. The closing meeting was ladies' night and Mr. Francis E. Stanley of Newton spoke on "Aviation." The Monday afternoon lectures at King's Chapel by members of the faculties of the Harvard Divinity School and the Andover Theological School have been suspended for the season. The last service at the Arlington Street Church until the reopening in the autumn was held on Easter Sunday. The church is closed early in the season in order that certain necessary repairs may be made. This cessation of activity on the part of many churches and local bodies in various parts of New England does not signify, however that nothing more in the religious line will be attempted during the remaining spring and summer months. Various local enterprises are being brought to a termination in order that an inventory of their value may be taken and a study may be made of the various reports which are now coming in from all parts of the country. The clearing house for these reports and the point of contact between representatives of many churches, is of course, the meetings of Anniversary Week, beginning the 21st of May. While the programme is far from complete, the announcements which have already been made indicate the maintenance of the standard of previous years. By way of preparation for these meetings, gatherings of various local bodies are soon to be held in order that certain definite suggestions may be offered at the yearly meetings. On the 14th of May an afternoon and evening meeting of the Fellowship for Social Justice will be held in the Church of the Third Religious Society in Dorchester. Plans are already on foot for the organization of a local chapter of this organization, and at the meeting on May 14 various plans will be worked out to submit to the annual meeting. The spring meeting of the South Middlesex Federation of Young People will be held on the afternoon and evening of May 7th at the First Parish Church in Cambridge. This meeting will be of peculiar interest in view of its purpose to map out a definite scheme for work along lines of social service which the various unions may engage in.

Another social function serving as a forerunner of the May meetings will be the annual luncheon of the alumnae of the Tuckerman School, to be held in Channing Hall on the 19th of May. This affair is held in connection with the closing exercises of a year which in all respects may be said to be completely sucecssful. A significant experiment along the lines of Sunday school organization in city churches has just been inaugurated at King's Chapel.

NEW BOOKS

THE PRIEST: A Tale of Modernism in New England—By the author of "Letters to His Holiness, Pope Pius X." Boston: Sherman, French & Co. 269 pp. Price, $1.25 net.

OUT of his own personal experiences, deep, vivid and painful, the author of this book has written, we suspect, a fiction that is near to reality in its dominant tones. He has certainly written with great earnestness and insistent sincerity—with some literary skill, moreover, though manifestly with an unpracticed hand. The hero of the story is a Roman Catholic priest of austere training and narrow, though intense idealisms, who, in a typical New England town is brought into contact with a young Unitarian clergyman of magnetic charm. Their first pointof contact is wholly civic and neighborly and has nothing to do with religion. But incidentally the priest borrows books from the heretic, is introduced to the new school of German Biblical criticism and modern philosophy, and the mischief is done. The other characters of the book are vividly drawn, with some humor, but rather crudely as types more than as subtly analyzed personalities. The bad folks are very bad, indeed, and good folks adorned with a little too much aureole. A promising beginning is made of a pretty romance with a very engaging heroine, but romance goes by the board in the stress of sterner passions. The theatrical finish of the Unitarian prophet is hardly pardonable. Why can motif-novelists find nothing else to do with ethical saints of progressive religion than to kill them off? On the whole, this story has more than superficial interest in its vivid revelation of things going on in the Roman Catholic Church of to-day. We might have wished that the type of modernism here portrayed had not orignated in the accidental impact with a Unitarian heretical library. The more interesting and significant phases of modernism, we suspect, do not originate in this manner, but develop through lines of study and thought having no conscious connection with specific Unitarianism.

COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF DEUTORONOMY [The Bible for Home and School Series]—By W. G. Jordan, B.A., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature in Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. New York: The Macmillan Co. 263 pp. Price, 75c.

DEUTORONOMY is one of the most interesting and significant books in the Old Testament to him who knows it well. This little commentary will help many not of the technically scholarly class to know it better. Dr. Jordan's point of view is of the latest of the higher critics, and his Introduction is especially clear and illuminative, presenting the historical problems, the dramatic significance, and the literary characteristics of the book in a very engaging fashion, with a very rational analysis of its contents. The notes are well proportioned, not often too technical, and there are not too many of them. The text is presented in such a way as to indicate the various sources without embarrassment to its continuous reading.

THE SOCIAL BASIS OF RELIGION—By Simon N. Patten, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Economy, University of Pennsylvania, author of "The New Basis of Civilization," etc. New York: The Macmillan Co. 247 pp. Price, $1.00

PROF. PATTEN has written a book of unique originality and rich suggestiveness, but somewhat difficult withal. Something very different from this might easily have been expected from a title like this. We have here, indeed, a not very pelucid experiment in religious pragmatism deeply involved in elements of psychologic and biologic speculation which make the path of the development of his essential idea seem devious to the casual reader. But it is all worth while—stimulative, thought-provoking and vitally modern and constructive in its outcome. The outcome appears in all its vigor in the chapter on "Social Religion" and what follows, but this is chapter XIII, and in the chapters preceding, while everything leads up to this, and all has value and engaging originality of suggestiveness, the thread of development is often tangled and obscured. Dr. Patten's point of insistence all the way through is in the pragmatic method of esteeming values. Starting with Comte's division of history into three epochs, the theological, the metaphysical and the positive, he would revise the analysis by recharacterizing the epochs as traditional, critical and pragmatic. The characteristic of modern tendency in religion and thought is happily illustrated in the growth in our language of more significant words expressing time values, rather than space values—or more vitally, terms of process rather than characteristic, or more significantly still, in terms of energy, rather than of quality. We have not space here in which to describe Dr. Patten's interesting development of his thesis; his chapter headings, "The Economic Interpretation of History," "The Social Interpretation of Thought," "The Social Process," "The Stages of Thought Development," "Morbid Degeneration," "Senile Degeneration," etc., but inadequately suggest their contents, and we pass over very vital factors of Dr. Patten's writing to speak of the significance of the chapters most interesting to us. "Natural and

historic religions," he says, "instead of being harmonious growths, seem to be antagonistic tendencies. They have little in common but a name. . . . The essential difference arises from the fact that natural religion is an expression of surplus energy, while historic religions have assumed their well-known forms under the pressure of deficit. Had the history of national resources been different, religion would have become not an expression of sorrow, but of joy."

"State religion," he says further on, "is a result of war and want; natural religion arises out of contact with the surplus and vigor of nature; social religion is quite as clearly based on the thought of peace and plenty. A religion of joy, a religion of sacrifice and a religion of service are contrasted ideals, each dominating in its own fitting circumstances."

"The religion of service," he adds, "could have no better exposition than in the teachings of Christ. What we need is not to formulate a clear statement of it, but to find conditions and institutions to make it effective. Christianity in this sense is not an historic institution. . . . It is difficult to associate Christ with a purely social religion because His teachings have been overshadowed by the striking events of His death. For this reason we do not see the fundamental opposition between what He taught and what His death is made to teach. If Christ's doctrines had been handed down to us by a Plato instead of a Paul, or by one who knew only of His life and not of His death, Christ to us would be a social leader, preaching salvation only in terms of love, co-operation and service." Dr. Patten does not mean by this that Paul was a mistake. The social condition of his time not only made his interpretation of Christ's message inevitable, but made it necessary. But the social conditions of our time make another type of religion just as necessary. "The Holy Spirit He promised is with us as a social spirit. . . . The social mission of the Church is not to make men religious, but to make them normal. . . . To make men normal is to start a train that leads to religious awakening." "The conflict of religion," he had said previously, "is between social habit and social feeling. The spiritual is the inner self in contrast to the social self. It is a suppressed heredity battling with the routine and habit of an external world." "The secular can be contrasted with the ecclesiastical, but not with the religious, for the secular life of a nation may express the religious tendencies better than the ecclesiastical."

And this strikes deep into theology: "Socially, God is purpose, not cause. He shapes ends, not beginnings. He is the eternal purpose that runs through events, and not the force that initiates them. He does not supplement men and society; He does what they do on a larger scale, with better plan and in more efficient ways. . . . The social God is telic, not functional, and is made manifest in the progress of men, and not in their failures." "God," it is written elsewhere, "is a being on whose trail we always are, but whom we never overtake. We approach Him only to find ourselves further off than before." Fnally, "Natural religion and morality make two inherent constituents of social religion. Both are to be found in earliest religions, and have continued as prominent elements ever since. . . . The third element is of later origin. No name has been given it. Since it appeared under such different aspects that it seems to have no unity. . . . I shall call it Social Anticipation. . . . Normal men modify to-day's acts by the faith and hope that needs to-morrow for their fulfillment. The future is in the present, and thus helps to construct itself."

There is much more in Dr. Patten's book than we have here suggested, and another reader might seize on other salient points to him more significant. But to us, what value the other chapters may have in developing very interesting and rather novel ideas of social progress and soul structure, lies wholly in their focus on the points we have here accentuated.

———o———

Some sermons are preceded by most incongruous hymns, and some texts fail because of inadequate emphasis; but we had hoped never to become accessory to either form of infelicity. However, in our last issue, a most timely article on present day issues by Hon. Clarence E. Carr was introduced by lines from a hymn which not only "had nothing to do with the case," but for the citation of which Mr. Carr was absolutely innocent; while the Rev. Elizabeth Padgham's charming article on "World Strangers" lost much of its point because the lines which were intended to introduce it went astray. Other things about our last issue were not as we would have wished them, and it was very late in reaching its readers because of misadventures in our publishing department. At a late date we learned that our previous printers, "The Robert Kerr Press," has retired from business, and we had in haste to secure new printers, which necessitated sudden changes and hasty make-up, and final delays. We hope that now our troubles are over. Of course, we do not believe in any theological Devil—being liberals—but if there is such a thing as a "Printer's Devil"—we know only the tradition thereof—surely he is no friend of ours, and his malign influences persistently war with our deeds of light.

OUR NATIONAL SOCIETIES

With headquarters in the building of the American Unitarian Association, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

Local offices at 104 East 20th Street, New York City; 175 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and Cor. Franklin and Geary Streets, San Francisco, Cal.

The American Unitarian Association

Founded in 1825.

The chief missionary organization of the Unitarian churches of America. It supports missionaries, establishes and maintains churches, holds conventions, aids in building meeting-houses, publishes books, tracts, and devotional works.

Address correspondence to the *Secretary*, Rev. Lewis G. Wilson.

Address contributions to the *Treasurer*, Francis H. Lincoln, Esq.

Publication Agent, Mr. C. L. Stebbins.

Unitarian Sunday-School Society

Founded in 1827.

Maintained by the Unitarian churches to promote religious and moral education. Publishes manuals and tracts, issues a Sunday-school paper, holds conventions, carries on a book-room. Branch at 175 Dearborn Street, Chicago.

President, Rev. William I. Lawrance

Treasurer, Mr. Richard C. Humphreys.

Superintendent of book-room, Mr. Philip C. McMurdie.

National Alliance of Unitarian Women

Organized in 1890

Promotes the local organization of the women of the Unitarian churches for missionary and denominational work.

Address correspondence to the *Clerk*, Miss Florence Everett

Address contributions to the *Treasurer*, Mrs. Lucia Kapp Noyes, 11 St. John St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.

Young People's Religious Union

Organized in 1896.

Promotes the organization of the young people of the Unitarian churches for "Truth, Worship and Service."

Address correspondence to Miss Grace R. Torr

Address contributions to the *Treasurer*, Mr. C. Arthur McMurdie.

National League of Unitarian Laymen

Organized in 1909

Promotes the organization of Men's Clubs in Unitarian churches, to bring about an increasing participation by laymen, not only in the local work of their churches, but also in the denomination at large, and to extend the activities of the church to the advancement of the social, moral, and religious interests of the community.

Honorary President, Hon. William H. Taft

President, Prof. William H. Carruth, Kansas University, Lawrence, Kas.

Secretary and Treasurer, Cyril H. Burdett, 135 Broadway, New York.

Proctor Academy

ANDOVER, N. H.

A Unitarian School for both sexes. Healthfully located in the foothills of the White Mountains. Separate Dormitories. New Buildings. Preparatory and Business Courses. Certificate privileges. Social culture. Gymnasium. Ten Acre Athletic Field. $250 a year—no extras. For catalogue address,

THEODORE PARKER FARR, A. M.
Principal.

Hackley School

TARRYTOWN, N. Y.

Rev. SAMUEL A. ELIOT, D. D., Pres. of Trustees

Fall Term Opens Wednesday, Sept. 20

For Catalogue address

WALTER B. GAGE, Headmaster

THE

Meadville Theological School

(Established 1844)

MEADVILLE, PA.

Trains men and women for a liberal and progressive ministry. For catalogue address the president,

F. C. SOUTHWORTH.

ALL QUESTIONS ANSWERED on DEFINITE INQUIRIES

AS TO FURNISHINGS AND MEMORIAL GIFTS FOR THE SACRED EDIFICE AND THE CEMETERY

Send for Illustrated Handbook and Data

J. & R. LAMB

Studios 23-25-27 Sixth Ave. New York

LAWRENCE & CONE, PRINTERS, DARIEN, CONN.

OUR CONSTRUCTIVE ISSUES

WE stand for an open and an honest pulpit; for freedom in truth-seeking, courage in truth-speaking, and the reverence of unfaltering sincerity in all issues of religion.

WE stand for religion that identifies itself explicitly with pure living, high thinking, and noble aspiring. The essential business of the church, we believe, is not to fortify a theology but to promote righteousness: and we make our basis of church fellowship not credal agreement but moral openness of purpose.

WE stand for a religion of the HERE and Now. Believing resolutely in Immortality, we insist that the first experiences of Immortality are in this world's living present: and God's sharing of To-day with us brings religion's chief concern.

WE stand for the final authority of reason and conscience in the things of religion. We believe that no outward church or institution has right to impose a creed, or establish a method of discipline, or define an exclusive fellowship of faith that shall stand paramount to the individual soul's responsibility of conscience and reason in determining faith conduct, and spiritual comradeship.

WE stand for a progressive theology conditioned on faith in a progressive revelation. We stand for an interpretation of God, and God's method of revelation, of the nature of man, and future destiny, that shall constantly square with the latest teaching of science and largest attainments of human society in ethical ideal and spiritual vision.